DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 213 UD 007 836

Evaluation of Seminar '68 Program ESEA (Title I).
Milwaukee Public Schools, Wis.
Pub Date 68
Note-76p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.90
Descriptors-*Changing Attitudes, Educational Programs, Federal Programs, *High School Students, *Intergroup Education, Measurement Techniques, *Program Evaluation, Self Evaluation, Social Discrimination, Student Attitudes, Student Opinion, Student Seminars, Summer Programs, Teacher Attitudes
Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title 1, ESEA Title 1, Milwaukee

An interschool summer seminar for high school students of varying racial and cultural backgrounds was held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The objective of the six-week seminar, funded under ESEA, Title I, was to give the students the opportunity to learn about the patterns which constitute prejudice. Due to the late approval of the program only 49 of a projected 300 students participated. Evaluation was based on student self-evaluations of the extent of learning in eight key content areas, findings from a measure of student attitude changes, and staff appraisals of the seminar. Despite the methodological problems inherent in this assessment, the data show that the seminar "provided both intellectual and emotional stimuli for the participants....(and) reached its objectives of giving students from diverse background the opportunity to learn together about the patterns which constitute prejudice." (NH)

ED 028213

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# EVALUATION OF

# SEMINAR '68 PROGRAM

# ESEA (TITLE I)

Summer, 1968

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Richard P. Gousha, Superintendent

UD 007 836

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| OBJECTIVES | 1 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS | 2 |
| EVALUATION | 6 |
| Limitations | 6 |
| Students' self-evaluation | 7 |
| Student attitude measures | 10 |
| Evaluation by staff | 23 |
| SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS | 27 |
| Students' self-evaluation | 27 |
| Student attitude measures | 28 |
| Additional student evaluations | 31 |
| Evaluation by staff | 32 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 32 |
| APPENDICES | |
| A--Student self-evaluation questionnaire and responses | 35 |
| B--Student attitude instrument and responses | 38 |
| C--Staff evaluation form | 64 |
| D--Student followup form and selected responses | 68 |

# INTRODUCTION

Seminar '68 was an interschool summer seminar designed to give high school students of varying racial and cultural backgrounds the opportunity to meet each other and learn about the patterns which constitute prejudice. The seminar was conducted on the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee campus from June 17 through July 31, 1968, a period of approximately six weeks. The program was funded under ESEA-Title I. Seminar participants were students from the Milwaukee Public Schools and certain suburban districts. All students were to begin their senior years during September, 1968. Participants belonged to varied racial, economic, social, and religious groups.

The program was orginally planned for 300 participants. However, due to late approval of the program, information was not made available to potential participants until shortly before the registration deadline. Forty-nine students completed the program.

Instructional staff members included five teachers from the Milwaukee Public Schools and one teacher from a suburban school district. The biracial staff included one woman member from the city schools.

## OBJECTIVES

The stated objectives of Seminar '68 included the following:

1. To have pupils understand key concepts necessary for an improvement of intergroup relations by:

    a. investigating the physical and historical relationships of people to the American scene;

b. examining the system of beliefs, feelings, and actions that constitute group prejudice;

c. analyzing the patterns of discrimination by which minorities are held in subordinate status;

d. creating an awareness of the range of reactions of minorities to discrimination.

2. To present the contradiction between the American Creed and the present status of minorities.

3. To take some first step toward change by means of cultural exchange experiences in Seminar '68.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

Staff members asked participants to have their parents complete an information sheet during the first week of the seminar. Forms were complete anonymously. Tables 1-7 indicate tabulated results for selected responses on the information sheet.

Table 1
FAMILY STATUS
N = 47

| Status | Frequency | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Living with both parents | 27 | 57.4 |
| Father deceased, mother remarried | 4 | 8.5 |
| Parents divorced, no remarriage | 5 | 10.6 |
| Parents divorced, mother only remarried | 3 | 6.4 |
| Parents divorced, both parents remarried | 3 | 6.4 |
| Parents separated | 5 | 10.6 |
| All other combinations | 0 | 0.0 |

As may be seen from Table 1 most participants for whom information was completed were living with both natural parents.

Table 2
PARENTS' RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

| Religion | Mother N = 44 | | Father N = 41 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Pct. | Frequency | Pct. |
| Catholic | 21 | 47.7 | 22 | 53.7 |
| Protestant | 19 | 43.2 | 15 | 36.6 |
| Jewish | 3 | 6.8 | 3 | 7.3 |
| Other | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| None | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.4 |

Table 2 indicates that the religious background of Seminar '68 students was most often Catholic, followed by membership in some Protestant denomination.

Table 3
PARENTS' RACIAL BACKGROUND

| Race | Mother N = 42 | | Father N = 42 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Pct. | Frequency | Pct. |
| White | 31 | 73.8 | 29 | 69.0 |
| Black | 9 | 21.4 | 11 | 26.2 |
| Other | 2 | 4.8 | 2 | 4.8 |

The racial composition of the group is illustrated by Table 3. Participants were predominantly white.

Table 4
LAST GRADE OF PARENTS' EDUCATION

| | Mother N = 44 | | Father N = 39 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Last grade | Frequency | Pct. | Frequency | Pct. |
| Less than high school graduate | 13 | 29.5 | 13 | 33.3 |
| High school graduate | 22 | 50.0 | 14 | 35.9 |
| Some college | 6 | 13.6 | 3 | 7.7 |
| College graduate | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.7 |
| College post graduate | 3 | 6.8 | 6 | 15.4 |

Most of the groups' parents completed high school; however, more did not complete high school than attended college.

Table 5
YEARLY FAMILY INCOME AFTER TAXES
N = 42

| Income | Frequency | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Less than $2,000 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $2,000 - $3,999 | 6 | 14.3 |
| $4,000 - $5,999 | 9 | 21.4 |
| $6,000 - $7,999 | 8 | 19.0 |
| $8,000 - $9,999 | 9 | 21.4 |
| $10,000 - $14,999 | 7 | 16.7 |
| $15,000 - $19,999 | 2 | 4.8 |
| $20,000 or more | 1 | 2.4 |

Approximately 62% of the participants' families had yearly incomes between $4,000 and $9,999 after taxes are deducted.

Table 6
NUMBER OF ROOMS IN HOUSE
N = 46

| Number (Rooms) | Frequency | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Five or less | 14 | 30.4 |
| Six or Seven | 18 | 39.1 |
| Eight or Nine | 4 | 8.7 |
| Ten or Eleven | 6 | 13.0 |
| Twelve or more | 4 | 8.7 |

Table 6 includes another indication of the economic situation of the participants. A large majority, approximately 70%, lived in homes of seven or less rooms.

Table 7
FREQUENCY OF PARENTS' GOING OUT
WITHOUT CHILDREN (PER MONTH)
N = 46

| Number of Occasions | Frequency | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Less than once | 17 | 37.0 |
| One or two | 12 | 26.1 |
| Three or four | 5 | 10.9 |
| Five to nine | 4 | 8.7 |
| Ten or more | 8 | 17.4 |

Nearly two-thirds of the parents indicated that they went out without their children two or fewer times per month. As may be noted by looking at the other extreme end of the scale, wide diversity is exhibited in this measure.

Tables 1-7 are not meant to exhaust the entire range of relevant variables. They were chosen from the information sheet since they were among the most complete answers to questions which are of interest in describing the various backgrounds. These tables are purely descriptive in nature. They indicate the diversity in the backgrounds of the participants.

## EVALUATION

The evaluation of Seminar '68 consisted of three basic parts. Students gave a self-evaluation of the amount which they felt that they had learned about eight key content areas. Student attitude changes were measured by means of an instrument known as a semantic differential. Staff members indicated their feelings concerning the effect of various activities on the objectives of Seminar '68.

A multitude of different comparisons may be made from the large amount of data collected. Comparisons detailed in this report are those which look at changes from the beginning of the program, with emphasis on the results of the followup administration.

### Limitations

Certain limitations are inherent to this evaluation, particularly in the section concerning measures of student attitudes. Since no control group existed, no causative link may be drawn between any changes in expressed attitudes and participation in Seminar '68. The effect of outside influences may be largely responsible for the changes. However, the data are of interest since they provide a description of the attitudes of 49 high school students toward various groups of people with whom they may, or may not, have had personal contact.

Although the students were instructed to reply to each item separately, the possibility of a "halo effect" in the marking of items must remain. A generally good or bad perception may have unduly influenced the marking of responses where it was impossible for the student to differentiate the specific item from the total concept. In addition, even though the student was instructed to indicate his attitude toward only one group of people at a time, it is unlikely that no relative comparisons took place in his mind. For these reasons, results should not be interpreted as absolutes; but as relative comparisons.

As shown in Tables 1-7, seminar students had varied backgrounds, which included most of the different groups of people listed on the instrument used to measure student attitudes. No inferences should be made, however, concerning the personal effect of these representatives on the changes in ratings for their group. Also, the ratings for groups of people are only expressed attitudes and feelings; the results are not necessarily actual charactistics, only a subjective rating.

Students' self-evaluation

Students were asked to evaluate how much they felt they had learned about eight selected areas during the immediately preceding week. The form was developed by the Department of Educational Research and Program Assessment in consultation with the seminar staff. A copy of the form is included in Appendix A. No evaluation was made during the third week which was shortened due to the July 4 holiday. Therefore, the evaluation forms completed during week four required the evaluation of a two week period. In addition to these five sequential evaluations during Seminar '68, a followup form was sent to all participants who completed the program approximately two and

one-half months after its close. This followup included exactly the same items, but asked the participants to reflect on the entire program.

A complete tabulation of the students' responses to what they felt they had learned is given in Appendix A. Table 8 includes a summary of the results of the students' evaluations.

Table 8
MEANS OF STUDENT SELF-EVALUATIONS
OF AMOUNT LEARNED BY WEEKS *

| Item | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Followup |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>in the past</u>. | 2.3 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.7(L) | 2.7 | 2.9(L) |
| 2. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>today</u>. | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| 3. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>in the past</u>. | 2.2(L) | 2.4 | 2.8(L) | 2.8 | 2.4(L) | 3.0 |
| 4. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>today</u>. | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.7(H) |
| 5. Beliefs, feelings, and actions which make up group prejudices | 2.7 | 2.3(L) | 3.0 | 3.5(H) | 3.4(H) | 3.6 |
| 6. The variety of reactions of minorities to discrimination | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| 7. Differences between what most people say and what they actually do. | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.4(H) | 3.6 |
| 8. My own beliefs or attitudes | 3.0(H) | 3.0(H) | 3.4(H) | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 |

* 1 = Nothing; 2 = Only a little; 3 = Quite a bit; 4 = Very much
H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

As will be noted from Table 8, the lowest ratings in each of the eight categories occurred during the first two weeks. The students' impressions of how much they were learning raised after the first two weeks of the seminar. In fact, the student responses two and one-half months following the close of Seminar '68, which represent the total effect, were higher in each category than at any other time. It therefore appears that Seminar '68 was a learning activity which generated momentum as it progressed and that students continued to feel the worth of participation several weeks afterward. A single cause for caution appears in this interpretation; only slightly more than two-thirds of the participants returned the October followup.

Followup self-evaluations created two clusters of categories. Students indicated that they had learned least about the two categories, mental attitudes and social relationships, which dealt with the past. All other categories were clustered together with higher ratings.

Student attitude measures

Student attitudes were measured through the use of an instrument called a semantic differential. A semantic differential instrument measures the psychological meaning of attitudes toward certain concepts. The concept measured for Seminar '68 participants was their perception of certain types of people. They indicated their feelings toward the ten following types of people: white, black, yellow, red, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, non-religious, poor, and wealthy.

Students reported their feelings toward each of these groups of people by responding to bipolar adjective pairs. Ten such pairs were used for each group. The adjective pairs were chosen by the Department of Educational Research and Program Assessment in consultation with the Seminar '68 staff. Pairs were chosen with regard to their apparent relevance, or face validity, to the concept of feelings about groups of people. Emphasis was placed upon choosing adjective pairs which were meaningful to the student. The ten pairs were friendly-unfriendly, good-bad, intelligent-unintelligent, strong-weak, fast-slow, large-small, superior-inferior, hard working-lazy, tolerant-intolerant, and helpful-unhelpful. All groups of people were rated on these same ten dimensions. Appendix B contains a copy of the instrument.

Responses were quantified on a 1-7 scale. Small values on the rating scale represent the member of the adjective pair which would be considered to have either a negative connotation or a lesser amount of the indicated attribute. Examples of the latter are speed and size as indicated by fast-slow and large-small, respectively.

A rating of 4.0 indicates the neutral point on each scale. A large majority of the ratings were greater than this neutral position. Beacuse of this majority, the text in this section will identify, with regard to a low rating, only those scales with a rating below the neutral point for a given group of people.

Seminar '68 students responded to this semantic differential during the first, fourth, and last weeks of the six week session. This instrument was also administered by mail during the mail followup during October. Appendix B contains complete tabulations of the results of the four administrations.

Black people. A summary of the results of the measurement of attitudes toward black people is given in Table 9.

Table 9
CHANGES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD
BLACK PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 5.1(H) | 5.2(H) | +0.2 | 4.9(H) | -0.2 | 4.8(H) | -0.3 |
| Good-Bad | 4.8 | 4.6 | -0.2 | 4.6 | -0.2 | 4.5 | -0.3 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.6 | +0.2 |
| Strong-Weak | 5.1(H) | 4.8 | -0.3 | 4.8 | -0.3 | 4.7 | -0.4 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.8 | 4.4 | -0.4 | 4.6 | -0.2 | 4.4 | -0.4 |
| Large-Small | 4.2 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.3 | +0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 3.9(L) | 4.0(L) | +0.1 | 4.1(L) | +0.2 | 4.0(L) | +0.1 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.7 | 4.3 | -0.4 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.5 | -0.2 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.3 | 4.6 | +0.3 | 4.6 | +0.3 | 4.6 | +0.3 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.9 | 4.8 | -0.1 | 4.8 | -0.1 | 4.5 | -0.4 |
| Composite | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.5 | -0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

As indicated in Table 9, the students' perceptions of black people was marked most positive on the friendly-unfriendly scale and least positive on the superior-inferior scale in the final administration. All but one of the attitudes toward black people were rated on the positive end of the scale.

Superior-inferior was rated at the neutral position.

Four of the scales showed positive gains from the first week to the mail administration.

White people. Table 10 contains a summary of the attitude measures concerning white people.

Table 10
CHANGES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD
WHITE PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.4 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.3 | -0.1 |
| Good-Bad | 4.5 | 4.3 | -0.2 | 4.4 | -0.1 | 4.3 | -0.2 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.8(H) | 4.9(H) | +0.1 | 4.7(H) | -0.1 | 4.9(H) | +0.1 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.2 | 3.9 | -0.3 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.1 | -0.1 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.6 | 4.3 | -0.3 | 4.3 | -0.3 | 4.4 | -0.2 |
| Large-Small | 4.3 | 4.4 | +0.1 | 4.1 | -0.2 | 4.1 | -0.2 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.4 | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.2 | -0.2 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.5 | 4.2 | -0.3 | 4.3 | -0.2 | 4.6 | +0.1 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 3.8(L) | 3.7(L) | -0.1 | 3.6(L) | -0.2 | 3.7(L) | -0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.1 | 3.9 | -0.2 | 4.0 | -0.1 | 4.0 | -0.1 |
| Composite | 4.4 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.3 | -0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Measures of students' perceptions yielded the highest rating for white people on the intelligent-unintelligent scale. Lowest rating was on the tolerant-intolerant scale. These catetories were consistent during all four responses; both were relatively far removed from clustering with any other scales.

Eight of the ten categories showed losses in ratings from the initial marking to the followup. Hard working-lazy and intelligent-unintelligent showed slight positive gains.

Eight of the categories were placed on the positive side of the scale; helpful-unhelpful was at the neutral position and tolerant-intolerant was placed on the negative side.

Yellow people. Student perceptions of yellow people are given in Table 11.

Ratings for yellow people changed very little. Many students indicated a lack of experience with these people and uniformly marked the neutral portion of the scale. This may account for the stability of results.

All mean ratings were above the neutral point except for large-small which was the lowest of any group for that pair. This pair indicated that students considered the small size of yellow people to be a distinguishing characteristic.

Table 11
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
YELLOW PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 | Mean | Change from Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.7 | 4.8 | +0.1 | 4.8 | +0.1 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
| Good-Bad | 4.8(H) | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.7 | -0.1 | 4.5 | -0.3 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.8(H) | 4.9 | +0.1 | 4.5 | -0.3 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.3 | 4.4 | +0.1 | 4.1 | -0.2 | 4.2 | -0.1 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.1 | 4.2 | +0.1 | 4.0 | -0.1 | 4.2 | -0.1 |
| Large-Small | 3.4(L) | 3.5(L) | +0.1 | 3.7(L) | +0.3 | 3.5(L) | +0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.1 | -0.1 | 4.1 | -0.1 |
| Hard Working-Lazy | 4.8(H) | 5.0(H) | +0.2 | 4.9(H) | +0.1 | 4.9(H) | +0.1 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | +0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.7 | +0.1 | 4.7 | +0.1 |
| Composite | 4.4 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Red people. Many ratings of red people were similar to those of yellow people; a statement of unfamiliarity with the group and uniform neutral ratings. Table 12 lists the results.

Table 12
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
RED PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Changes From Week 1 | Mean | Changes From Week 1 | Mean | Changes From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.7 | +0.1 | 4.5 | -0.1 |
| Good-Bad | 4.6 | 4.7(H) | +0.1 | 4.7 | +0.1 | 4.4 | -0.2 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.4 | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.7 | +0.3 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.7 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.5 | -0.2 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.5 | 4.3 | -0.2 | 4.7 | +0.2 | 4.3 | -0.2 |
| Large-Small | 4.1(L) | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.1(L) | 4.0(L) | -0.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.8(H) | 4.6 | -0.2 | 4.8(H) | 0.0 | 4.7(H) | -0.1 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.4 | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.5 | +0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.4 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.3 | -0.1 |
| Composite | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

As may be seen from Table 12, seven of ten characteristics showed a slight decrease in rating from the beginning of the seminar to the middle of October. However, this decrease was so slight that it was not reflected in the composite mean. All final ratings were at the neutral point or above.

Jewish people. Table 13 summarizes the responses of seminar participants to the adjective pairs concerning Jewish people.

Table 13
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
JEWISH PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From week 1 | Mean | Change From week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.2 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.3 | +0.1 |
| Good-Bad | 4.2 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.5 | +0.3 | 4.5 | +0.3 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 5.0(H) | 5.3(H) | +0.3 | 4.9 | -0.1 | 5.1(H) | +0.1 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.1 | 4.3 | +0.2 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.0 | 4.4 | +0.3 | 4.0(L) | 0.0 | 4.1 | +0.1 |
| Large-Small | 4.0 | 4.3 | +0.3 | 4.0(L) | 0.0 | 4.1 | +0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.1 | 4.2(L) | +0.1 | 4.2 | +0.1 | 4.2 | +0.1 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.7 | 5.1 | +0.4 | 5.0(H) | +0.3 | 5.1(H) | +0.4 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.1 | 4.5 | +0.4 | 4.3 | +0.2 | 4.2 | +0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 3.9(L) | 4.6 | +0.7 | 4.2 | +0.3 | 4.0(L) | +0.1 |
| Composite | 4.2 | 4.6 | +0.4 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.4 | +0.2 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Jewish people received especially high ratings on the intelligent-unintelligent and hard working-lazy scales. Much less consistency in ratings was found for Jewish people than for other groups. A relatively large positive gain in mean ratings took place between weeks one and four. The following administrations were lower than week four, but higher than week one. Overall positive gains in ratings were in good-bad and hard working-lazy comparisons.

Catholic people. Ratings on the adjective pairs for Catholic people are give in Table 14.

Table 14
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
CATHOLIC PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.9(H) | 4.8(H) | -0.1 | 4.6 | -0.3 | 4.6 | -0.3 |
| Good-Bad | 4.7 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.7(H) | 0.0 | 4.3 | -0.4 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.6 | 4.8(H) | +0.2 | 4.7(H) | +0.1 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.3 | 4.4 | +0.1 | 4.1(L) | -0.2 | 4.1 | -0.2 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.3 | 4.4 | +0.1 | 4.2 | -0.1 | 4.2 | -0.1 |
| Large-Small | 4.1(L) | 4.2 | +0.1 | 4.3 | +0.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.4 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.3 | -0.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
| Hard Working-Lazy | 4.7 | 4.4 | -0.3 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.6 | -0.1 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.1(L) | 4.1(L) | 0.0 | 4.1(L) | 0.0 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.7 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.7(H) | 0.0 |
| Composite | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | -0.1 | 4.4 | -0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

As may be seen in Table 14, ratings for Catholic people showed a slight overall decline. Six of the ten comparisons declined; none increased. Largest negative changes occurred on the friendly-unfriendly and good-bad scales.

Protestant people. Table 15 indicates the ratings which Seminar '68 participants gave to Protestant people.

Table 15
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
PROTESTANT PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.7(H) | 4.6(H) | -0.1 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.5(H) | -0.2 |
| Good-Bad | 4.4 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.5(H) | +0.1 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | +0.1 | 4.4 | -0.1 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.2 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.1 | -0.1 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.2 | 4.1(L) | -0.1 | 4.0(L) | -0.2 | 4.1 | -0.1 |
| Large-Small | 4.1(L) | 4.1(L) | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.1 | -0.1 | 4.0(L) | -0.2 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.7(H) | 4.5 | -0.2 | 4.7(H) | 0.0 | 4.5(H) | -0.2 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.3 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.5 | +0.2 | 4.2 | -0.1 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.5 | 4.4 | -0.1 | 4.6 | +0.1 | 4.3 | -0.2 |
| Composite | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.3 | -0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

The slight decrease in ratings of Protestant people shown in Table 15 is similar to that exhibited in Table 14 for Catholic people. Eight of ten dimensions showed slight decreases in scores; one increased slightly and one was unchanged.

Non-religious people. After giving their perceptions of the previous three religious groups, seminar students were asked to give their impressions of non-religious people. Results appear in Table 16.

Table 16
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
NON-RELIGIOUS PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 4.3 | 4.8(H) | +0.5 | 4.5 | +0.2 | 4.7(H) | +0.4 |
| Good-Bad | 4.0 | 4.3 | +0.3 | 4.3 | +0.3 | 4.2 | +0.2 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 4.4(H) | 4.6 | +0.2 | 4.6(H) | +0.2 | 4.6 | +0.2 |
| Strong-Weak | 3.8(L) | 4.1 | +0.3 | 4.1 | +0.3 | 3.8(L) | 0.0 |
| Fast-Slow | 3.8(L) | 4.2 | +0.4 | 4.0(L) | +0.2 | 3.8(L) | 0.0 |
| Large-Small | 3.9 | 4.2 | +0.3 | 4.1 | +0.2 | 3.8(L) | -0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 3.9 | 3.8(L) | -0.1 | 4.0(L) | -0.1 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.2 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.6(H) | +0.4 | 4.5 | +0.3 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 3.8(L) | 4.0 | +0.2 | 4.2 | +0.4 | 4.3 | +0.5 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.1 | 4.3 | +0.2 | 4.4 | +0.3 | 4.3 | +0.2 |
| Composite | 4.0 | 4.3 | +0.3 | 4.3 | +0.3 | 4.2 | +0.2 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Six of the ten dimensions showed positive gains; only one showed a slight negative gain. Four dimensions clustered at the bottom of the ratings. All four were slightly below the neutral point and were the pairs which showed no change or a slight loss in score. These pairs were strong-weak, fast-slow, large-small, and superior-inferior.

Poor people. Perceptions of poor people are given in Table 17.

Table 17
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
POOR PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 5.1(H) | 4.9(H) | -0.2 | 4.9(H) | -0.2 | 4.9(H) | -0.2 |
| Good-Bad | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.6 | -0.2 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 3.8 | 4.1 | +0.3 | 3.8(L) | 0.0 | 4.0(L) | +0.2 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.3 | 4.1 | -0.1 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.5 | +0.2 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.1 | 4.2 | +0.1 | 4.0 | -0.1 | 4.2 | +0.1 |
| Large-Small | 4.1 | 4.4 | +0.2 | 4.3 | +0.1 | 4.1 | -0.1 |
| Superior-Inferior | 3.6(L) | 3.9(L) | -0.3 | 3.9 | -0.3 | 4.1 | +0.5 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.8 | 4.6 | -0.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 4.6 | 4.7 | +0.1 | 4.9 | +0.3 | 4.8 | +0.2 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 4.6 | 4.7 | +0.1 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.7 | +0.1 |
| Composite | 4.4 | 4.5 | +0.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.5 | +0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Changes in perception were in the positive direction for six comparisions, slightly negative for three, and one was unchanged. Largest gain was in the superior-inferior comparison.

Wealthy people. Seminar '68 participants also indicated their perceptions of wealthy people. These results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
WEALTHY PEOPLE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER
SEMINAR '68

| Adjective Pair | Week 1 | Week 4 | | Week 6 | | Followup | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 | Mean | Change From Week 1 |
| Friendly-Unfriendly | 3.4 | 3.4(L) | 0.0 | 3.9 | +0.5 | 3.8 | +0.4 |
| Good-Bad | 4.0 | 4.1 | +0.1 | 4.2 | +0.2 | 4.1 | +0.1 |
| Intelligent-Unintelligent | 5.5(H) | 5.2(H) | -0.3 | 5.2(H) | -0.3 | 4.9(H) | -0.6 |
| Strong-Weak | 4.2 | 3.9 | -0.3 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | -0.4 |
| Fast-Slow | 4.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Large-Small | 4.2 | 3.8 | -0.4 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 |
| Superior-Inferior | 4.7 | 4.6 | -0.1 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 4.2 | -0.5 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 4.6 | 4.3 | -0.3 | 4.3 | -0.3 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 3.3(L) | 3.4(L) | +0.1 | 3.4(L) | +0.1 | 3.3(L) | 0.0 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 3.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 | +0.2 | 3.7 | +0.2 |
| Composite | 4.2 | 4.0 | -0.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.1 | -0.1 |

H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Changes in attitudes toward wealthy people were more diverse than for other groups. Four adjective pairs showed no change. Three pairs showed increases and three showed decreases.

The largest increase was on the friendly-unfriendly scale. All the decreases were relatively large: intelligent-unintelligent, strong-weak, and superior-inferior.

Four scales were rated below the neutral point. These were friendly-unfriendly, strong-weak, tolerant-intolerant, and helpful-unhelpful.

Evaluation by staff

The staff members of Seminar '68 completed evaluation forms at the end of the second, fourth, and sixth weeks. Appendix C contains a sample staff questionnaire.

Activity evaluation. Staff members were asked to list activities which contributed to the accomplishment of the objectives of Seminar '68, activities which had no effect, and activities which had a negative effect. Table 19 indicates the responses given by the staff. Note that only those activities which contributed or had a negative effect and were mentioned by more than one staff member are listed. Activities having no effect are omitted to increase clarity of the table.

As indicated by Table 19 an overwhelming majority of activities were rated as having contributed to the accomplishment of the objectives of Seminar '68. Only four total instances of activities having negative effects were mentioned. In addition to the three listed in the table, one person mentioned the late arrival of books.

Content evaluation. The staff members also evaluated the amount which they thought the students had learned about the same eight key areas evaluated by the students. Table 20 gives the mean ratings for each area.

Staff members also rated the effectiveness of their group planning sessions. These ratings are given in Appendix C.

Table 19
STAFF MEMBERS' RATINGS OF ACTIVITIES
DURING SEMINAR '68

| Activity | Number of Responses | |
|---|---|---|
| | Positive Contribution | Negative Effect |
| First Two Weeks (5 responses) | | |
| Speakers: | | |
| International Institute | 5 | 0 |
| Migrant Opp. Center | 3 | 0 |
| Spanish Council | 2 | 0 |
| Keynote | 0 | 2 |
| Field trips--Milwaukee Co. | 4 | 0 |
| "Beyond the Melting Pot" readings | 2 | 0 |
| Development of Seminar Creed | 2 | 0 |
| Small group discussions | 2 | 0 |
| Class presentation--stratification and creed | 2 | 0 |
| Middle Two Weeks (5 responses) | | |
| Speakers: | | |
| "Rich Man, Poor Man" | 3 | 0 |
| All others | 5 | 1 |
| Class presentation--"We and They" | 4 | 0 |
| Readings and discussions | 3 | 0 |
| Film--"Watts Riot" | 3 | 0 |
| Recreational activities | 2 | 0 |
| Last Two Weeks (6 responses) | | |
| Films and filmstrips: | | |
| Myth of Prejudice | 3 | 0 |
| Man Child | 2 | 0 |
| Family of Man | 2 | 0 |
| Discussions: | | |
| Religion in today's world | 4 | 0 |
| Racial problems and implications | 3 | 0 |
| Grocery store assignment | 2 | 0 |

Table 20
STAFF MEMBERS' OPINION
OF AMOUNT LEARNED BY
STUDENTS IN EIGHT SELECTED AREAS*

| Item | First Two Weeks N = 5 | Middle Two Weeks N = 5 | Last Two Weeks N = 6 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>in the past</u>. | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8(L) |
| 2. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>today</u>. | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.5(H) |
| 3. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>in the past</u>. | 3.0(H) | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| 4. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>today</u>. | 2.6 | 3.4(H) | 3.5(H) |
| 5. Beliefs, feelings, and actions which make up group prejudices | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.5(H) |
| 6. The variety of reactions of minorities to discrimination | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| 7. Differences between what most people say and what they actually do. | 2.1(L) | 2.6(L) | 3.5(H) |
| 8. Their own beliefs or attitudes | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 |

*1 = Nothing; 2 = Only a little; 3 = Quite a bit; 4 = Very much
H = Highest rating for week
L = Lowest rating for week

Additional student evaluations. Participants were asked additional questions at the time of the followup mailing. Open-ended comments were requested. A sample list of these may be found in Appendix D. Appendix D also contains representative samples of the comments offered by participants.

Two-thirds of the 33 respondents to the followup questionnaire answered "No" to the questions, "Was Seminar '68 what you expected it to be?" (11 marked "Yes"; 22 marked "No"). An overwhelming majority of the "No" answers stated that Seminar '68 was better than they had expected. (17 marked "Better"; 2 marked "Worse"; and 2 were undecided). All respondents stated that they would recommend the seminar to their friends. In fact, many comments indicated that they already had given such a recommendation.

Respondents were also asked to name the most valuable and least valuable experiences they had during Seminar '68. The three most often mentioned valuable experiences were: (Number of responses in parentheses)

1. The opportunity to meet others with varied backgrounds. (18)
2. Lectures by guest speakers. (3)
3. Atmosphere created by the teachers. (3)

Thirteen of the respondents stated that it was impossible for them to designate a least valuable activity; they felt all activities were extremely valuable. However, of those activities mentioned in this category the following were mentioned by more than one person.

1. Visit to International Institute. (2)
2. Tour of Milwaukee and suburbs. (2)
3. Inability of certain students to interact with others. (2)

## SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS

Forty-nine students from Milwaukee and suburbs completed the Seminar '68 program. Through this seminar, students who had just completed their junior year were given the opportunity to meet and interact with others having varied racial, economic, social, and religious backgrounds. Participants studied the patterns which make up group prejudice.

### Students' self-evaluation

Students evaluated their own progress during each week of the seminar, except week three. The self ratings for the first two weeks were lower than for later periods. Even in these early weeks, 80% of the ratings were at the midpoint of the scale or above. Later ratings were consistently higher. The final rating, approximately two and one-half months after the close of the program, indicated that their mean retrospections nearly reached the highest possible point on the scale. Eight of the ten key areas of course content received especially high ratings. The two lowest ratings were for the two areas of study which dealt with the past. Similar items dealing with today's conditions were included among the eight highly rated items.

The students indicated a high regard for what they learned during the six weeks of the program. The program apparently generated momentum after a relatively slow start. Responses indicated that returning to their own schools and friends did nothing to dampen the enthusiasm for Seminar '68 as a learning experience.

Student attitude measures

An attempt was made to measure the attitudes of Seminar '68 participants toward people of varied racial, religious, and economic backgrounds. They were asked to respond to their feelings about ten bipolar adjective pairs concerning each of ten groups of people.

Extremes in mean perceptions are mentioned only for ratings less than 4.0 or greater than or equal to 4.7. These extremes are given for information only; no conclusions may be drawn concerning the precise source or reason for these specific feelings. While evidence exists for certain changes having taken place, no six week seminar can be expected to be totally responsible for attitudes developed over many years. It is also impossible to determine the degree to which interactions with student representatives of each group helped shape the attitudes as compared with the structured program. No attempt was ever made to say that ratings for a group represent what a group actually "is"; all ratings refer to expressed feelings and attitudes about the group.

Interpretations of the data concerning attitude changes must be limited because no evidence is available concerning how attitudes and feelings may have changed without involvement in Seminar '68. No control group was available. No information is available concerning any shifts by any group in their feelings toward other groups.

Composite ratings for different groups showed a very narrow range during any single administration. However, differences appear for certain groups between administrations and for different adjective pairs within groups. The majority of the ratings

for all groups were larger than 4.0 which was the point one-half way between the extremes. Changes in feelings will be reported in this section only if the net change is 0.3 or greater. (See Tables 9-18.) All net comparisons are made from the initial response to the followup administration of the instrument by mail.

After participation in Seminar '68, black people were perceived as being less friendly, less good, less strong, less fast, less helpful, and more tolerant. Changes in attitudes and feelings were more negative toward black people than any other group. However, black people were always perceived as friendly, strong, and inferior.

Perceptions of white people showed little change. Most comparisons exhibited a slight negative change, but none were large. The total group pictured white people as intelligent, but intolerant.

Measures of feelings and attitudes about yellow people were also very stable. The only reportable change was that they were marked as less good. As a whole, yellow people were seen as hard working, intelligent, friendly, helpful, and small.

A similar lack of change was shown in feelings toward red people. No reportable changes in perception were noted. Red people were characterized as hard working.

The most positive changes in attitudes toward religious groups occurred toward Jewish people. Largest changes indicated that Jewish people were considered more hard working and good. Overall characterization of this group was intelligent and hard working.

Attitudes toward Catholic people remained stable except for two comparisons. They were considered less good and less friendly afterwards. Catholic people were thought of as being helpful.

Feelings about Protestant people were also very stable. No reportable changes occurred. Neither were there any extreme ratings.

Attitudes concerning non-religious people generally showed a more positive trend. Non-religious people were considered more tolerant, more friendly, and harder working at the conclusion of the program. This group was generally considered to be friendly, but weak, slow, small, and inferior.

Responses concerning poor people showed only one reportable change. This group gained in the superior rating. They were classified as friendly, hard working, tolerant, and helpful.

Attitudes concerning wealthy people were very diverse. Many characteristics received highly consistent ratings; others showed much change. Overall ratings were lower than for any other group. A positive change was measured towards the friendly dimension. Negative changes indicated that wealthy people were also considered less intelligent, strong, and superior. They were still rated high on the intelligent scale, but were considered unfriendly, weak, unhelpful, and intolerant.

The position is again noted that this data and discussion are presented as purely descriptive information concerning the perceptions of Seminar '68 participants. No definite link may be demonstrated between participation and changes. The reader is cautioned against concluding that any ratings indicate personal characteristics of the members of the rated groups who participated in the seminar.

Additional student evaluations

Student responses to the additional questions asked at the time of the followup administration were generally very enthusiastic. Caution must be applied in this section, as in the other follow-up results. Nearly one-third of those contacted by mail did not return the materials. It was not possible to determine how well those returning the questionnaires represented the total group.

Composite results indicate an endorsement for Seminar '68. A majority thought that Seminar '68 was better than they originally expected. Every questionnaire indicated that the respondent would recommend the seminar for his (her) friends. Many indicated they already had given this recommendation.

More than half of the responses stated that the single most valuable experience during the seminar was the opportunity to meet other people having different backgrounds and experiences. When asked to list the single least valuable experience, the most common response indicated that all activities had value. It was considered impossible and unfair to single out any one activity as having little value.

Opened-ended comments (See Appendix D.) included suggestions for improving the program. The three most common suggestions were:

1) Get information to potential participants as early as possible. The amount of time available to meet the deadline for returning registration materials was too short this year.

2) A good method of advertising the seminar would be to sponsor school assemblies for potential participants. Former students could be used to give a description of the meaning of involvement in the program.

3) Have programs similar to Seminar '68 for parents.

In summary, students thought very highly of their experiences during the six weeks of Seminar '68. Their comments expressed the feeling that a similar program would be valuable to others.

Evaluation by staff

Staff members indicated that most activities contributed to the accomplishment of the objectives of Seminar '68. While an admitted amount on non-objectivity must exist in these ratings, responses indicated a general feeling of success.

An examination and comparison of the responses of staff members and students concerning the amount learned in the eight key areas shows a similarity of rating. Both groups rated areas of study concerning the past below contemporary considerations. Some disparity exists between staff and students for the early part of the session, but a remarkable similarity exists for the last rating by the staff.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

This section deals only with recommendations which can be made from a careful examination of the data or from the writer's experience and knowledge of proper research procedures. No attempt will be made to recommend changes in the content or methods used in the seminar. Basic decisions concerning objectives should be determined by the supervisiors and project staff. No data is available to compare the effects of this curriculum with other possible courses of study.

Evaluation data indicate that less was learned about some areas than others. However, it is not necessary to assume that this denotes a negative aspect of the seminar. The possibility exists that these are actually the proper proportions in order to achieve the objectives; e.g. The amount learned about past relationships between dominant and minority groups is less than that learned about contemporary relationships. Decisions concerning the proper relationships for accomplishing the objectives and the appropriateness of the objectives must be left to the project directors.

A similar interpretation must be given to the measures of attitude change. There were no right or wrong answers, per se; supervisors must determine whether apparent changes are positively related to the achievement of objectives.

Concerning the measurement of attitude changes, control groups must be established if changes are to be definitely attributed to a seminar of this type. Without a group for comparison it is impossible to determine which changes were motivated through the course and which ones were the result of community occurrances and items in the news during the time measured.

In order for evaluation data to better assist in answering questions concerning the meeting of objectives, course objectives must be given in behavioral terms or operationally defined.

Planning and allocation of funds should take place at an early enough date so that a longer time is available to publicize the program. This strategy would allow more potential participants

to give serious consideration to registering for the next seminar. In addition, the possibilities should be explored for implementing the student suggestions for publicizing the program.

The Department of Educational Research and Program Assessment should be consulted by the seminar staff as soon as possible after plans are made for the next program. The total design for the evaluation should be completed before the beginning of the program. Development of instruments should again take place jointly between project staff and Department of Educational Research and Program Assessment, but more time is necessary for the development of the best possible instruments.

The data demonstrate that Seminar '68 provided both intellectual and emotional stimuli for the participants. On this basis, Seminar '68 appears to have reached its objective of giving students from diverse backgrounds the opportunity to learn together about the patterns which constitute prejudice.

# APPENDIX A

SEMINAR '68

Number_____

Indicate the amount you think you have learned during the last week about each of the following.

| | NOTHING | ONLY A LITTLE | QUITE A BIT | VERY MUCH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>in the past</u>. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other <u>today</u>. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>in the past</u>. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups <u>today</u>. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 5. Beliefs, feelings, and actions which make up group prejudice. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 6. The variety of reactions of minorities to discrimination. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 7. Differences between what most people say and what they actually do. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 8. My own beliefs or attitudes. | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |

6/68
kja

Table 21
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES OF
STUDENT SELF-EVALUATIONS OF
AMOUNT LEARNED IN SEMINAR '68**

| | | RESPONSE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | |
| Item* | Week | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | Total |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | 11.5 | 28 | 53.8 | 15 | 28.8 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 2 | 4 | 8.7 | 23 | 50.0 | 13 | 28.3 | 6 | 13.0 | 46 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 22 | 55.0 | 12 | 30.0 | 40 |
| | 5 | 6 | 13.6 | 8 | 18.2 | 23 | 52.3 | 7 | 15.9 | 44 |
| | 6 | 3 | 6.8 | 16 | 36.4 | 16 | 36.4 | 9 | 20.5 | 44 |
| | F*** | 2 | 6.1 | 7 | 21.2 | 15 | 45.5 | 9 | 27.3 | 33 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 16 | 30.8 | 21 | 40.4 | 12 | 23.1 | 52 |
| | 2 | 2 | 4.3 | 13 | 28.3 | 23 | 50.0 | 8 | 17.4 | 46 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.0 | 18 | 45.0 | 18 | 45.0 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.1 | 13 | 29.5 | 26 | 59.1 | 44 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.5 | 8 | 18.2 | 13 | 29.5 | 21 | 47.7 | 44 |
| | F*** | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 6 | 18.2 | 24 | 72.7 | 33 |
| 3 | 1 | 10 | 19.2 | 22 | 42.3 | 17 | 32.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 2 | 3 | 6.5 | 25 | 54.3 | 14 | 30.4 | 4 | 8.7 | 46 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.0 | 9 | 22.5 | 20 | 50.0 | 9 | 22.5 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 14 | 31.8 | 21 | 47.7 | 8 | 18.2 | 44 |
| | 6 | 6 | 13.6 | 16 | 36.4 | 19 | 43.2 | 3 | 6.8 | 44 |
| | F*** | 2 | 6.1 | 7 | 21.2 | 13 | 39.4 | 11 | 33.3 | 33 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 30.8 | 25 | 48.1 | 11 | 21.2 | 52 |
| | 2 | 4 | 8.7 | 9 | 19.6 | 21 | 45.7 | 12 | 26.1 | 46 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 18 | 45.0 | 16 | 40.0 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.1 | 20 | 45.5 | 19 | 43.2 | 44 |
| | 6 | 3 | 6.8 | 7 | 15.9 | 15 | 34.1 | 19 | 43.2 | 44 |
| | F*** | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 27 | 81.8 | 33 |
| 5 | 1 | 7 | 13.5 | 14 | 26.9 | 19 | 36.5 | 12 | 23.1 | 52 |
| | 2 | 9 | 20.0 | 14 | 31.1 | 18 | 40.0 | 4 | 8.9 | 45 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.0 | 6 | 15.0 | 17 | 42.5 | 15 | 37.5 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 3 | 6.8 | 14 | 31.8 | 26 | 59.1 | 44 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.5 | 5 | 11.4 | 12 | 27.3 | 25 | 56.8 | 44 |
| | F*** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 8 | 24.2 | 23 | 69.7 | 33 |
| 6 | 1 | 11 | 21.2 | 15 | 28.8 | 22 | 42.3 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 2 | 7 | 15.2 | 21 | 45.7 | 6 | 13.0 | 12 | 26.1 | 46 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.0 | 8 | 20.0 | 20 | 50.0 | 10 | 25.0 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.1 | 19 | 43.2 | 20 | 45.5 | 44 |
| | 6 | 3 | 6.8 | 9 | 20.5 | 16 | 36.4 | 16 | 36.4 | 44 |
| | F*** | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 11 | 33.3 | 19 | 57.6 | 33 |
| 7 | 1 | 10 | 19.2 | 11 | 21.2 | 14 | 26.9 | 17 | 32.7 | 52 |
| | 2 | 2 | 4.3 | 20 | 43.5 | 14 | 30.4 | 10 | 21.7 | 46 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.7 | 3 | 7.7 | 18 | 46.2 | 15 | 38.5 | 39 |
| | 5 | 3 | 6.8 | 4 | 9.1 | 15 | 34.1 | 22 | 50.0 | 44 |
| | 6 | 3 | 6.8 | 4 | 9.1 | 11 | 25.0 | 26 | 59.1 | 44 |
| | F*** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 8 | 24.2 | 23 | 69.7 | 33 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 15 | 28.8 | 15 | 28.8 | 20 | 38.5 | 52 |
| | 2 | 5 | 10.9 | 6 | 13.0 | 21 | 45.7 | 14 | 30.4 | 46 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 8 | 20.0 | 26 | 65.0 | 40 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2.3 | 3 | 6.8 | 16 | 36.4 | 24 | 54.5 | 44 |
| | 6 | 3 | 6.8 | 4 | 9.1 | 12 | 27.3 | 25 | 56.8 | 44 |
| | F*** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 7 | 21.2 | 24 | 72.7 | 33 |

* See page 36 for item identification.
** 1 = Nothing; 2 = Only a little; 3 = Quite a bit; 4 = Very much
*** Followup

# APPENDIX B

BLACK PEOPLE

Number_____

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

WHITE PEOPLE

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligen |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

YELLOW PEOPLE

Number_____

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

---

RED PEOPLE

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

JEWISH PEOPLE Number_____

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

---

CATHOLIC PEOPLE

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

PROTESTANT PEOPLE Number_____

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

NON-RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

POOR PEOPLE

Number_____

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

WEATHLY PEOPLE

| | EXTREMELY | | | NEUTRAL | | | EXTREMELY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| friendly | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unfriendly |
| good | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | bad |
| intelligent | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unintelligent |
| strong | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | weak |
| fast | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | slow |
| large | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | small |
| superior | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | inferior |
| hard working | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | lazy |
| tolerant | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | intolerant |
| helpful | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | unhelpful |

Table 22
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD BLACK PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 19 | 36.5 | 12 | 23.1 | 11 | 21.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| Unfriendly | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 10 | 26.3 | 11 | 28.9 | 9 | 23.7 | 6 | 15.8 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 14 | 33.3 | 16 | 38.1 | 10 | 23.8 | 2 | 4.8 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 12 | 36.4 | 7 | 21.2 | 9 | 27.3 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Good- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 25 | 48.1 | 12 | 23.1 | 8 | 15.4 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Bad | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 19 | 50.0 | 8 | 21.1 | 9 | 23.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 22 | 51.2 | 10 | 23.3 | 8 | 18.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 8 | 24.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Intelligent- | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 11.8 | 22 | 43.1 | 12 | 23.5 | 7 | 13.7 | 3 | 5.9 | 51 |
| Unintelligent | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.7 | 4 | 10.8 | 15 | 40.5 | 9 | 24.3 | 6 | 16.2 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 19 | 44.2 | 11 | 25.6 | 8 | 18.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 14 | 42.4 | 7 | 21.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Strong- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 19 | 36.5 | 14 | 26.9 | 12 | 23.1 | 7 | 13.5 | 52 |
| Weak | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 15 | 39.5 | 10 | 26.3 | 9 | 23.7 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 18 | 41.9 | 11 | 25.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 6 | 14.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 48.5 | 9 | 27.3 | 4 | 12.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Fast- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 20 | 38.5 | 14 | 26.9 | 9 | 17.3 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Slow | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.7 | 5 | 13.5 | 17 | 45.9 | 4 | 10.8 | 8 | 21.6 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 23 | 53.5 | 11 | 25.6 | 3 | 7.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 20 | 60.6 | 7 | 21.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 22 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD BLACK PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 36 | 72.0 | 11 | 22.0 | 2 | 4.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 50 |
| Small | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 70.3 | 7 | 18.9 | 2 | 5.4 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 30 | 69.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 23 | 69.7 | 5 | 15.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Superior- | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 4 | 7.8 | 40 | 78.4 | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 5.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 51 |
| Inferior | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 27 | 71.1 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 28 | 65.1 | 3 | 7.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 22 | 66.7 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Hard working- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 3 | 5.8 | 22 | 42.3 | 13 | 25.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| Lazy | 4 | 1 | 2.7 | 2 | 5.4 | 3 | 8.1 | 18 | 48.6 | 5 | 13.5 | 4 | 10.8 | 4 | 10.8 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 11.6 | 21 | 48.8 | 8 | 18.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 12 | 36.4 | 7 | 21.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 8 | 15.7 | 23 | 45.1 | 9 | 17.6 | 8 | 15.7 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| Intolerant | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 16 | 42.1 | 6 | 15.8 | 9 | 23.7 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 11.6 | 3 | 7.0 | 13 | 30.2 | 10 | 23.3 | 8 | 18.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 8 | 24.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 6 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 |
| Helpful- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 25 | 48.1 | 7 | 13.5 | 8 | 15.4 | 9 | 17.3 | 52 |
| Unhelpful | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 19 | 50.0 | 9 | 23.7 | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 21 | 48.8 | 10 | 23.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 8 | 24.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 23
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD WHITE PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair* | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- Unfriendly | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 6 | 11.5 | 24 | 46.2 | 6 | 11.5 | 12 | 23.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 12 | 31.6 | 13 | 34.2 | 5 | 13.2 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 21 | 48.8 | 13 | 30.2 | 5 | 11.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 15.2 | 15 | 45.5 | 4 | 12.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Good- Bad | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 33 | 63.5 | 9 | 17.3 | 6 | 11.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 18 | 47.4 | 9 | 23.7 | 6 | 15.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.8 | 23 | 54.8 | 12 | 28.6 | 4 | 9.5 | 1 | 2.4 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 19 | 57.6 | 5 | 15.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- Unintelligent | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 21 | 40.4 | 16 | 30.8 | 9 | 17.3 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 14 | 36.8 | 9 | 23.7 | 10 | 26.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 47.6 | 11 | 26.2 | 9 | 21.4 | 2 | 4.8 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 15 | 45.5 | 6 | 18.2 | 7 | 21.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Strong- Weak | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 28 | 53.8 | 11 | 21.2 | 3 | 5.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 4 | 10.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.7 | 22 | 59.5 | 6 | 16.2 | 4 | 10.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 37 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 28 | 66.7 | 8 | 19.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 3 | 7.1 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Fast- Slow | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 31 | 59.6 | 11 | 21.2 | 3 | 5.8 | 6 | 11.5 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 22 | 57.9 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 28 | 66.7 | 2 | 16.7 | 2 | 4.8 | 3 | 7.1 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 7 | 21.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 23 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD WHITE PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 36 | 70.6 | 7 | 13.7 | 3 | 5.9 | 3 | 5.9 | 51 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 68.4 | 5 | 13.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 78.6 | 5 | 11.9 | 1 | 2.4 | 2 | 4.8 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 25 | 75.8 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 35 | 67.3 | 5 | 9.6 | 7 | 13.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 23 | 60.5 | 4 | 10.5 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.8 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 59.5 | 7 | 16.7 | 2 | 4.8 | 5 | 11.9 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 24 | 72.7 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 46.2 | 16 | 30.8 | 8 | 15.4 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 18 | 47.4 | 9 | 23.7 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 22 | 53.7 | 11 | 26.8 | 4 | 9.8 | 2 | 4.9 | 41 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 5 | 15.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 7 | 13.5 | 22 | 42.3 | 13 | 25.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 8.1 | 3 | 8.1 | 8 | 21.6 | 14 | 37.8 | 5 | 13.5 | 3 | 8.1 | 1 | 2.7 | 37 |
| | 6 | 3 | 7.1 | 4 | 9.5 | 8 | 19.0 | 17 | 40.5 | 8 | 19.0 | 2 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 42 |
| | F** | 5 | 15.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 11 | 33.3 | 4 | 12.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 7 | 13.5 | 24 | 46.2 | 11 | 21.2 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 6 | 15.8 | 17 | 44.7 | 5 | 13.2 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.8 | 2 | 4.8 | 2 | 4.8 | 24 | 57.1 | 9 | 21.4 | 1 | 2.4 | 2 | 4.8 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 14 | 42.4 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 24
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES—
ATTITUDES TOWARD YELLOW PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 27 | 51.9 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Unfriendly | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 19 | 50.0 | 7 | 18.4 | 6 | 15.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 21 | 48.8 | 10 | 23.3 | 9 | 20.9 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 13 | 39.4 | 9 | 27.3 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Good- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 55.8 | 11 | 21.2 | 6 | 11.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 52 |
| Bad | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 55.3 | 8 | 21.1 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 51.2 | 11 | 25.6 | 9 | 20.9 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 8 | 24.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 21 | 40.4 | 14 | 26.9 | 9 | 17.3 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Unintelligent | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.9 | 14 | 36.8 | 10 | 26.3 | 6 | 15.8 | 5 | 13.2 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 50.0 | 11 | 26.2 | 9 | 21.4 | 1 | 2.4 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 13 | 39.4 | 12 | 36.4 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Strong- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 5 | 9.6 | 31 | 59.6 | 4 | 7.7 | 6 | 11.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Weak | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 26 | 68.4 | 1 | 2.6 | 7 | 18.4 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 29 | 67.4 | 5 | 11.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 5 | 15.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Fast- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 7 | 13.5 | 32 | 61.5 | 7 | 13.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| Slow | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 10.5 | 26 | 68.4 | 2 | 5.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 38 | 88.4 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 5 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 24 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD YELLOW PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 4 | 7.7 | 6 | 11.5 | 11 | 21.2 | 26 | 50.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 4 | 10.5 | 3 | 7.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 24 | 63.2 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 | 5 | 11.6 | 29 | 67.4 | 3 | 7.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 8 | 24.2 | 19 | 57.6 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.9 | 40 | 78.4 | 6 | 11.8 | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 31 | 81.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 33 | 76.7 | 4 | 9.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 26 | 78.8 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 24 | 46.2 | 9 | 17.3 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 39.5 | 9 | 23.7 | 9 | 23.7 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 48.8 | 8 | 18.6 | 7 | 16.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 16 | 48.5 | 5 | 15.2 | 9 | 27.3 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 29 | 55.8 | 10 | 19.2 | 4 | 7.7 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 20 | 52.6 | 8 | 21.1 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 22 | 51.2 | 14 | 32.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 5 | 15.2 | 14 | 42.4 | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 32 | 61.5 | 9 | 17.3 | 7 | 13.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 21 | 55.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 8 | 21.1 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 26 | 60.5 | 4 | 9.3 | 10 | 23.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 18 | 54.5 | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 25
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD RED PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 35 | 67.3 | 6 | 11.5 | 5 | 9.6 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Unfriendly | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 22 | 57.9 | 6 | 15.8 | 9 | 23.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 22 | 51.2 | 6 | 14.0 | 9 | 20.9 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 19 | 59.4 | 4 | 12.5 | 5 | 15.6 | 2 | 6.3 | 32 |
| Good- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 63.5 | 12 | 23.1 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Bad | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 21 | 55.3 | 6 | 15.8 | 9 | 23.7 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 22 | 51.2 | 11 | 25.6 | 7 | 16.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 16 | 50.0 | 8 | 25.0 | 5 | 15.6 | 1 | 3.1 | 32 |
| Intelligent- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 31 | 59.6 | 9 | 17.3 | 6 | 11.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| Unintelligent | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.5 | 22 | 57.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 7 | 18.4 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 22 | 51.2 | 5 | 11.6 | 8 | 18.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.1 | 4 | 12.5 | 14 | 43.8 | 4 | 12.5 | 8 | 25.0 | 1 | 3.1 | 32 |
| Strong- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 22 | 42.3 | 19 | 36.5 | 5 | 9.6 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Weak | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 20 | 52.6 | 9 | 23.7 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 47.6 | 11 | 26.2 | 7 | 16.7 | 3 | 7.1 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 14 | 43.8 | 10 | 31.3 | 3 | 9.4 | 2 | 6.3 | 32 |
| Fast- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 33 | 63.5 | 7 | 13.5 | 5 | 9.6 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Slow | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 24 | 63.2 | 6 | 15.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 24 | 55.8 | 9 | 20.9 | 6 | 14.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.1 | 19 | 59.4 | 10 | 31.3 | 2 | 6.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 25 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD RED PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 37 | 71.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 86.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 | 29 | 67.4 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.1 | 22 | 68.8 | 6 | 18.8 | 2 | 6.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 40 | 76.9 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 29 | 76.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 33 | 76.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 4 | 9.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 25 | 78.1 | 2 | 6.3 | 2 | 6.3 | 1 | 3.1 | 32 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 24 | 46.2 | 12 | 23.1 | 7 | 13.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.5 | 19 | 50.0 | 6 | 15.8 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 51.2 | 13 | 30.2 | 4 | 9.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 14 | 43.8 | 9 | 28.1 | 4 | 12.5 | 3 | 9.4 | 32 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 34 | 65.4 | 7 | 13.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 24 | 63.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 23 | 53.5 | 8 | 18.6 | 7 | 16.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.3 | 14 | 43.8 | 7 | 21.9 | 6 | 18.8 | 2 | 6.3 | 32 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 36 | 69.2 | 7 | 13.5 | 5 | 9.6 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 25 | 65.8 | 5 | 13.2 | 5 | 13.2 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 30 | 69.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.4 | 20 | 62.5 | 2 | 6.3 | 3 | 9.4 | 4 | 12.5 | 32 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 26
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWISH PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- | 1 | 4 | 7.8 | 1 | 2.0 | 7 | 13.7 | 18 | 35.3 | 10 | 19.6 | 9 | 17.6 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| Unfriendly | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 15.8 | 16 | 42.1 | 7 | 18.4 | 5 | 13.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 20 | 46.5 | 11 | 25.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 16 | 48.5 | 5 | 15.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Good- | 1 | 3 | 5.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 28 | 54.9 | 13 | 25.5 | 3 | 5.9 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| Bad | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 13.5 | 19 | 51.4 | 4 | 10.8 | 7 | 18.9 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 25 | 58.1 | 8 | 18.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 4 | 12.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 17 | 33.3 | 8 | 15.7 | 16 | 31.4 | 7 | 13.7 | 51 |
| Unintelligent | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 31.6 | 8 | 21.1 | 11 | 28.9 | 7 | 18.4 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.8 | 13 | 31.0 | 11 | 26.2 | 13 | 31.0 | 3 | 7.1 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 12 | 36.4 | 8 | 24.2 | 7 | 21.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 33 |
| Strong- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 19.6 | 31 | 60.8 | 5 | 9.8 | 3 | 5.9 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| Weak | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2,6 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 76.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 | 32 | 74.4 | 3 | 7.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 6 | 18.2 | 22 | 66.7 | 3 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Fast- | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 5.9 | 5 | 9.8 | 29 | 56.9 | 8 | 15.7 | 3 | 5.9 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| Slow | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 25 | 65.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 32 | 74.4 | 6 | 14.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 15.2 | 22 | 66.7 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 26 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWISH PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.9 | 4 | 7.8 | 34 | 66.7 | 8 | 15.7 | 3 | 5.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 51 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 73.7 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 29 | 67.4 | 6 | 14.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 25 | 75.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 35 | 68.6 | 12 | 23.5 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 29 | 76.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 76.7 | 4 | 9.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 2 | 3.9 | 2 | 3.9 | 3 | 5.9 | 18 | 35.3 | 7 | 13.7 | 12 | 23.5 | 7 | 13.7 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 14 | 36.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 14 | 36.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 14 | 32.6 | 10 | 23.3 | 12 | 27.9 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 14 | 42.4 | 6 | 18.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 8 | 24.2 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 2 | 3.9 | 4 | 7.8 | 6 | 11.8 | 22 | 43.1 | 9 | 17.6 | 6 | 11.8 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.5 | 19 | 50.0 | 8 | 21.1 | 6 | 15.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 5 | 11.6 | 22 | 51.2 | 9 | 20.9 | 3 | 7.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 14 | 42.4 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 5 | 9.8 | 1 | 2.0 | 6 | 11.8 | 25 | 49.0 | 6 | 11.8 | 6 | 11.8 | 2 | 3.9 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 19 | 50.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 25 | 58.1 | 3 | 7.0 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 16 | 48.5 | 3 | 9.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 27
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD CATHOLIC PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- Unfriendly | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 18 | 34.6 | 15 | 28.8 | 7 | 13.5 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 17 | 44.7 | 6 | 15.8 | 7 | 18.4 | 5 | 13.2 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.1 | 19 | 45.2 | 11 | 26.2 | 5 | 11.9 | 4 | 9.5 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 15.2 | 15 | 45.5 | 5 | 15.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Good- Bad | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 25 | 48.1 | 9 | 17.3 | 6 | 11.5 | 7 | 13.5 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 19 | 50.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 5 | 13.2 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 23 | 53.5 | 11 | 25.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 18 | 54.5 | 4 | 12.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- Unintelligent | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 30 | 57.7 | 8 | 15.4 | 7 | 13.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 23 | 60.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 6 | 15.8 | 6 | 15.8 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 58.1 | 9 | 20.9 | 4 | 9.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 6 | 18.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Strong- Weak | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 6 | 11.5 | 33 | 63.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.7 | 1 | 2.7 | 24 | 64.9 | 5 | 13.5 | 2 | 5.4 | 4 | 10.8 | 37 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 35 | 81.4 | 4 | 9.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 27 | 81.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Fast- Slow | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 9.6 | 35 | 67.3 | 5 | 9.6 | 3 | 5.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 28 | 73.7 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 36 | 83.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 27 | 81.8 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 27 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES—
ATTITUDES TOWARD CATHOLIC PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 42 | 80.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| Small | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 86.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 35 | 81.4 | 4 | 9.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 30 | 90.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Superior- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 38 | 73.1 | 4 | 7.7 | 3 | 5.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Inferior | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 73.7 | 5 | 13.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 31 | 72.1 | 4 | 9.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Hard'ng working- | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 26 | 50.0 | 12 | 23.1 | 6 | 11.5 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| Lazy | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 10.5 | 20 | 52.6 | 7 | 18.4 | 3 | 7.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 25 | 58.1 | 5 | 11.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 60.6 | 7 | 21.2 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant- | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 8 | 15.4 | 25 | 48.1 | 10 | 19.2 | 1 | 1.9 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Intolerant | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 9 | 23.7 | 17 | 44.7 | 3 | 7.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 6 | 14.0 | 21 | 48.8 | 6 | 14.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 9 | 27.3 | 14 | 42.4 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Helpful- | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 24 | 46.2 | 12 | 23.1 | 4 | 7.7 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| Unhelpful | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 19 | 50.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 5 | 13.2 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 24 | 55.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 28
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD PROTESTANT PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 26 | 50.0 | 14 | 26.9 | 6 | 11.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| Unfriendly | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 21 | 55.3 | 11 | 28.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 23 | 54.8 | 12 | 28.6 | 4 | 9.5 | 3 | 7.1 | 42 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 18 | 54.5 | 7 | 21.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Good- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 35 | 67.3 | 9 | 17.3 | 7 | 13.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| Bad | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 23 | 60.5 | 8 | 21.1 | 6 | 15.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 67.4 | 8 | 18.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 23 | 69.7 | 5 | 15.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 32 | 61.5 | 13 | 25.0 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| Unintelligent | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 68.4 | 5 | 13.2 | 6 | 15.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 27 | 62.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 21 | 63.6 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Strong- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 42 | 80.8 | 7 | 13.5 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| Weak | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 | 84.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 37 | 86.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 84.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Fast- | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 40 | 76.9 | 6 | 11.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| Slow | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 35 | 92.1 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 37 | 86.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 27 | 81.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 28 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD PROTESTANT PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 45 | 86.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 35 | 92.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 36 | 83.7 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 87.9 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 42 | 80.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 27 | 71.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 37 | 86.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 26 | 78.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 29 | 55.8 | 8 | 15.4 | 9 | 17.3 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 27 | 71.1 | 3 | 7.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 27 | 62.8 | 8 | 18.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 60.0 | 7 | 21.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 4 | 7.8 | 30 | 58.8 | 9 | 17.6 | 6 | 11.8 | 1 | 2.0 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 73.7 | 2 | 5.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 25 | 58.1 | 8 | 18.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 27 | 52.9 | 13 | 25.5 | 5 | 9.8 | 4 | 7.8 | 51 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 27 | 71.1 | 3 | 7.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 67.4 | 7 | 16.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 20 | 60.6 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 29
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD NON-RELIGIOUS PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- Unfriendly | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 27 | 51.9 | 9 | 17.3 | 8 | 15.4 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 57.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 9 | 23.7 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 21 | 48.8 | 10 | 23.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 17 | 51.5 | 6 | 18.2 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Good- Bad | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 3 | 5.8 | 34 | 65.4 | 7 | 13.5 | 4 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.9 | 21 | 55.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 8 | 21.1 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 26 | 60.5 | 7 | 16.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 2 | 6.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- Unintelligent | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 25 | 48.1 | 10 | 19.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 20 | 52.6 | 5 | 13.2 | 7 | 18.4 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 19 | 44.2 | 11 | 25.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 15 | 45.5 | 7 | 21.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Strong- Weak | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 7 | 13.5 | 38 | 73.1 | 3 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 73.7 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 30 | 69.8 | 5 | 11.6 | 3 | 7.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 26 | 78.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Fast- Slow | 1 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 38 | 73.1 | 5 | 9.6 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 73.7 | 6 | 15.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 36 | 83.7 | 5 | 11.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 26 | 78.8 | 3 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 29 Continued

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD NON-RELIGIOUS PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 40 | 76.9 | 5 | 9.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 76.3 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 34 | 79.1 | 4 | 9.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 27 | 81.8 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 5 | 9.6 | 33 | 63.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 68.4 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 76.7 | 1 | 2.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 27 | 81.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Hard Working-Lazy | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 31 | 59.6 | 10 | 19.2 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 55.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 23 | 53.5 | 11 | 25.6 | 5 | 11.6 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 60.6 | 7 | 21.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 5 | 9.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 24 | 46.2 | 3 | 5.8 | 7 | 13.5 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 5 | 13.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.5 | 18 | 47.4 | 4 | 10.5 | 6 | 15.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 5 | 11.6 | 20 | 46.5 | 6 | 14.0 | 7 | 16.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 14 | 42.4 | 6 | 18.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 7 | 13.5 | 29 | 55.8 | 9 | 17.3 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.9 | 21 | 55.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 6 | 15.8 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 25 | 58.1 | 7 | 16.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 20 | 60.6 | 3 | 9.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 30
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD POOR PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- Unfriendly | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 19 | 36.5 | 11 | 21.2 | 5 | 9.6 | 13 | 25.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 14 | 36.8 | 8 | 21.1 | 7 | 18.4 | 6 | 15.8 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 16 | 37.2 | 9 | 20.9 | 9 | 20.9 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 11 | 33.3 | 10 | 30.3 | 5 | 15.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Good- Bad | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 24 | 46.2 | 10 | 19.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 7 | 13.5 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.7 | 1 | 2.7 | 16 | 43.2 | 5 | 13.5 | 10 | 27.0 | 4 | 10.8 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 48.8 | 11 | 25.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 14 | 42.4 | 10 | 30.3 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Intelligent- Unintelligent | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 14 | 26.9 | 21 | 40.4 | 6 | 11.5 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 4 | 10.5 | 18 | 47.4 | 4 | 10.5 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 6 | 14.0 | 22 | 51.2 | 3 | 7.0 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 5 | 15.2 | 19 | 57.6 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Strong- Weak | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 26 | 50.0 | 10 | 19.2 | 5 | 9.6 | 3 | 5.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 8.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 59.5 | 4 | 10.8 | 6 | 16.2 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 27 | 62.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 22 | 66.7 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Fast- Slow | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 5 | 9.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 27 | 51.9 | 6 | 11.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 26 | 68.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 13.2 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 33 | 76.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 25 | 75.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 30 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD POOR PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 37 | 71.2 | 5 | 9.6 | 1 | 1.9 | 4 | 7.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 78.4 | 1 | 2.7 | 3 | 8.1 | 4 | 10.8 | 37 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 32 | 74.4 | 4 | 9.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 27 | 81.8 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 4 | 7.7 | 5 | 9.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 33 | 63.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 8.1 | 2 | 5.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 67.6 | 2 | 5.4 | 3 | 8.1 | 2 | 5.4 | 37 |
| | 6 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 28 | 65.1 | 1 | 2.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 23 | 69.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 14 | 26.9 | 13 | 25.0 | 5 | 9.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 13 | 25.0 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.5 | 16 | 42.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 11 | 28.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 18 | 41.9 | 8 | 18.6 | 7 | 16.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 15 | 45.5 | 6 | 18.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 8 | 15.4 | 17 | 32.7 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 10.5 | 17 | 44.7 | 4 | 10.5 | 8 | 21.1 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 15 | 34.9 | 11 | 25.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 7 | 16.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 10 | 30.3 | 6 | 18.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 6 | 18.2 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 9.6 | 23 | 44.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 6 | 11.5 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 20 | 52.6 | 6 | 15.8 | 6 | 15.8 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.3 | 24 | 55.8 | 5 | 11.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 5 | 11.6 | 43 |
| | F** | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 19 | 57.6 | 4 | 12.1 | 6 | 18.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member for the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member for the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 31
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD WEALTHY PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Friendly- Unfriendly | 1 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 7 | 13.5 | 20 | 38.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 5 | 13.2 | 8 | 21.1 | 5 | 13.2 | 11 | 28.9 | 4 | 10.5 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 5 | 11.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 16.7 | 16 | 38.1 | 9 | 21.4 | 4 | 9.5 | 1 | 2.4 | 42 |
| | F** | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 7 | 21.2 | 12 | 36.4 | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 33 |
| Good- Bad | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 6 | 11.5 | 31 | 59.6 | 7 | 13.5 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 10.5 | 22 | 57.9 | 4 | 10.5 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 25 | 58.1 | 8 | 18.6 | 4 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 2 | 6.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Intelligent- Unintelligent | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 10 | 19.2 | 11 | 21.2 | 11 | 21.2 | 17 | 32.7 | 52 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 34.2 | 8 | 21.1 | 7 | 18.4 | 9 | 23.7 | 38 |
| | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 37.2 | 12 | 27.9 | 6 | 14.0 | 9 | 20.9 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 12 | 36.4 | 8 | 24.2 | 6 | 18.2 | 5 | 15.2 | 33 |
| Strong- Weak | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 31 | 59.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 11.5 | 52 |
| | 4 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 65.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 2 | 5.3 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 31 | 72.1 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 27 | 81.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Fast- Slow | 1 | 3 | 5.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 6 | 11.5 | 32 | 61.5 | 3 | 5.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| | 4 | 4 | 10.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 63.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 4 | 10.5 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 31 | 72.1 | 5 | 11.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 72.7 | 5 | 15.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

Table 31 Continued
RESPONSE FREQUENCIES--
ATTITUDES TOWARD WEALTHY PEOPLE WITH
REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJECTIVE PAIRS *

| Adjective Pair * | Week | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | N | Pct. | |
| Large-Small | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 | 37 | 71.2 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3. | 5 | 9.6 | 52 |
| | 4 | 3 | 8.1 | 1 | 2.7 | 2 | 5.4 | 25 | 67.6 | 3 | 8.1 | 2 | 5.4 | 1 | 2.7 | 37 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 32 | 74.4 | 4 | 9.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 4.7 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 78.8 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 |
| Superior-Inferior | 1 | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 29 | 55.8 | 5 | 9.6 | 6 | 11.5 | 9 | 17.3 | 52 |
| | 4 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 57.9 | 5 | 13.2 | 5 | 13.2 | 4 | 10.5 | 38 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 60.5 | 4 | 9.3 | 6 | 14.0 | 6 | 14.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 | 21 | 63.6 | 4 | 12.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Hard working-Lazy | 1 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 19 | 36.5 | 10 | 19.2 | 7 | 13.5 | 8 | 15.4 | 52 |
| | 4 | 5 | 13.2 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 10 | 26.3 | 10 | 26.3 | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| | 6 | 4 | 9.5 | 2 | 4.8 | 1 | 2.4 | 15 | 35.7 | 7 | 16.7 | 11 | 26.2 | 2 | 4.8 | 42 |
| | F** | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 4 | 12.1 | 12 | 36.4 | 5 | 15.2 | 6 | 18.2 | 4 | 12.1 | 33 |
| Tolerant-Intolerant | 1 | 8 | 15.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 10 | 19.2 | 17 | 32.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 7 | 18.4 | 4 | 10.5 | 7 | 18.4 | 13 | 34.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 7 | 16.3 | 5 | 11.6 | 6 | 14.0 | 16 | 37.2 | 7 | 16.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 43 |
| | F** | 7 | 21.2 | 3 | 9.1 | 7 | 21.2 | 11 | 33.3 | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 9.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 33 |
| Helpful-Unhelpful | 1 | 7 | 13.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 8 | 15.4 | 21 | 40.4 | 5 | 9.6 | 4 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 52 |
| | 4 | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 5 | 13.2 | 14 | 36.8 | 5 | 13.2 | 3 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 38 |
| | 6 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 4 | 9.3 | 21 | 48.8 | 7 | 16.3 | 3 | 7.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 43 |
| | F** | 7 | 21.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 12 | 36.4 | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 33 |

*1 = Most extreme rating for the negative member of the adjective pair;
7 = Most extreme rating for the positive member of the adjective pair;
** = Followup

# APPENDIX C

SEMINAR '68

Staff Evaluation Form Date _____

We would like your opinions about the activities of the previous two weeks of Seminar '68. Please complete and return in the envelope provided.

1. List the activities which occurred during the past two week period which you believe contributed toward accomplishing the objectives of Seminar '68.

2. List the activities which occurred during the past two week period which you feel may have had a negative effect or no effect toward accomplishing the objectives of Seminar '68.

Negative effect

No effect

3. a. Rate the effectiveness of the staff planning sessions.

| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely helpful | Quite helpful | Slightly helpful | Not helpful |

b. Indicate anything which would have made the planning sessions for the last two weeks more helpful in obtaining the objectives of Seminar '68.

Table 32
EVALUATION OF STAFF
PLANNING SESSIONS

| | First Two Weeks | Middle Two Weeks | Last Two Weeks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely helpful | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Quite helpful | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Slightly helpful | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Not helpful | 0 | 0 | 1 |

# APPENDIX D

SEMINAR '68

Number_____

Indicate the amount you think you have learned (Consider the entire session of Seminar '68) about each of the following:

| | NOTHING | ONLY A LITTLE | QUITE A BIT | VERY MUCH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other in the past. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Mental attitudes of dominant and minority groups to each other today. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups in the past. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Social relationships among dominant and minority groups today. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Beliefs, feelings, and actions which make up group prejudice. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. The variety of reactions of minorities to discrimination. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Differences between what most people say and what they actually do. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8 My own beliefs or attitudes. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

10/68
njm

1. Was Seminar '68 what you expected it to be? Yes____ No____.

   If not, was Seminar '68 better____ or worse____?

   Comments:

2. Would you recommend Seminar '68 or a similar course to your friends? Yes____ No____.

   Comments:

3. What was the <u>one most valuable</u> experience in Seminar '68?

4. Was was the <u>one least valuable</u> experience in Seminar '68?

---

The following representative excerpts were taken from the comments given by the students on the mail followup.

Comments are quoted with any grammatial or spelling errors left in their original form.

Certain responses may not appear to be directly answering the question. However, comments are included in the place written by the students.

1. Was Seminar '68 what you expected it to be?

> "Seminar '68 was the best class I ever attended. Most of the kids who attended agreed. The students, teachers, and programs were fantastic. I've found high school very disappointing and juvenile after Seminar '68."
>
> "I think that every possible effort should be made to intrest (sic) as many people as possible in this or similar programs."
>
> "We all learned a lot from it though grading was not stressed. It was not hard to get to know everyone so the course included friendship."
>
> "Being with other people, talking with other people and discussing things with other people was just what I expected Seminar to be."

"I expected it to be more formal ... I think the program was hampered by the fact that some kids came only for fun. Also, more films would have been helpful."

"I felt I learned what was needed to know about minority problems."

"I didn't really know just what to expect."

"I know now that I had never really woken up from a dream."

"I expected it to be a class far over my head, but instead it closely involved and continues to involve me."

"What I heard about the Seminar I idealized quite a bit, which was not right, so I was a little disappointed in the beginning, but as time went on I realized my error and found that it was a fruitful experience.... The most important thing I learned was to accept people for what they are and not what I think from first glance or some action at first."

"I learned about situations that I never thought had occurred in our modern day society. ... Why don't you have something set up like this for parents as well as student (sic) because they need it.

"It was an excellent experience that more kids should be subjected to."

"I think we should have been able to interact more socially."

"I feel that better books are available than the ones used."

"The faculty was tremendous."

"Seminar '68 fulfilled my expectations complete (sic)."

"I never learned so much in one summer before."

"We could of really had a better turn out."

"I knew quite a bit about it beforehand and was sure I would enjoy it."

2. Would you recommend Seminar '68 or a similar course to your friends?

"My friends, as well as I, would not be exposed to such great cultural, religious, and ethnic differences otherwise."

"... will help them as much as it did me."

"They need it."

"... should be continued except on a larger basis. This program could be a major force in the breakdown of prejudice."

"... possibly a representative sent to the schools to explain the course."

"I would strongly recommend ... an elective course during the school year too. It is urgently needed."

"Some of my friends need it badly along with the parents."

"... may I suggest that the forms be sent out earlier this year? ... We, the members of Seminar '68 should go to all the schools in the city, encouraging Juniors to attend the Seminar. ... Each member should make one speech at their own school and one at another school not represented last year."

"Put a course similar to Seminar '68 in each public high school."

"Many of the kids I know don't know much about minority groups and city problems."

"I learned that some Black people are just as dumb and prejudice as some white (sic)."

"I'd like to see a program like this for <u>adults</u> ... so that they could learn the facts and reasoning behind what they see."

"I would recommend this program to my friends because it helps you to understand other people better and ... what we all need is more understanding."

"I already did."

"I found that my friends are prejudice and they like to descrimination (sic)."

3. What was the <u>one most valuable</u> experience in Seminar '68?

"I'd have to say knowing the teachers was the most valuable experience."

"Meeting the people and getting to know them."

"... chance for a student to express his own feelings, thoughts and viewpoint on certain things."

"Getting to talk to Negroes my own age. Up until this time I never talked with any Negroes because my school and community is all white. I also acquired many lasting friendships."

"I did not know people from many other groups."

"Meeting kids from the core and getting to know their side of view and ideas."

"I find it impossible to limit them down to the 'one' most important. I'm sorry."

"The whole course was very valuable."

"I met black people and found that they weren't any different than a white person."

"Through this I have been able to accept people more for what they are and not what kind of clothes they wear."

"The informality of our most marvelous teachers. The charisma they had, the ingenious and fantastic way we could relate to them."

"Actually, there was no one most valuable experience. Being exposed was just such a good experience for me I cannot begin to tell you."

4. What was the one least valuable experience in Seminar '68?

"I didn't have one."

"Can't think of one."

"I don't think there was one."

"... although we studied the various groups... we never really found an answer to what we can do now to help solve these problems."

"Probably the exams, for they served no purpose ... other than a means to give you a grade."

"I don't think I had a least valuable experience ... I wish it could have been longer."

"Filling out the 'blue' paper." (semantic differential form).

"All experiences were valuable."

"I can't recall any situation ... that was a waste of time."

"The children didn't want to talk about the things we did. They were lazy."